

**REMARKS**

Claims 10-20 remain pending in this application. No claims have been canceled or added.

**Priority**

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's acknowledgment of the claim for priority and safe receipt of the priority document.

**35 U.S.C. §112**

Claim 19 has been amended to overcome the Examiner's rejection. Applicants agree with the Examiner's interpretation of the claim limitation and have amended the claim accordingly.

**35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103**

Claims 10, 12, 14, 16, 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Shimizu et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,289,254). Claims 11, 13, 15, 17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu et al in view of Sano (U.S. Patent No. 6,377,964). These rejections are traversed as follows.

As previously argued, Shimizu et al do not disclose or suggest a CAD information management system in which manufacturers provide and manage a

plurality of databases which can be accessed by the user. On the other hand, Shimizu et al disclose that databases are located at a user's CAD system and are managed and maintained by the user. As such, Shimizu et al cannot realize the advantage of the present invention in which it is not necessary for a user to obtain and manage CAD information from a plurality of different manufacturers. Furthermore, in Shimizu et al, when CAD information is updated, the user has to retrieve the necessary information and update its own database.

In response to Applicants' arguments, the Examiner asserts that the claims do not require that each database be managed by a separate manufacturer. Therefore, the claims have been amended to further clarify that the user terminal is connected to a plurality of databases which are respectively located at and managed by a plurality of different manufacturers. Therefore, it should be clear that the pending claims recite that each manufacturer manages a database and that the user terminal can receive information from these databases managed by the different manufacturers. A user can search for and obtain the necessary information without having to store all of the CAD information from each manufacturer in its own database.

The deficiencies in Shimizu et al are not overcome by resort to Sano. As mentioned in the previously filed response, the Examiner merely relies upon Sano for disclosing update history information. Sano does not disclose or suggest a system in which a plurality of databases are respectively located at and managed by a plurality


of different manufacturers such that a user can easily and directly retrieve information as needed. As such, it is submitted that the pending claims patentably define the present invention over the cited art.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

By   
Shrinath Malur  
Reg. No. 34,663  
(703) 684-1120